

AmerenUE

Revised 2000

**GENERAL ASSESSMENT
OF ELECTRIC SERVICE**

June 29, 2001

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

I. Introduction

AmerenUE presents this 2000 General Assessment of Electric Reliability to the Illinois Commerce Commission in accordance with Section 411.160 of the 83 Illinois Administrative Code 411.

AmerenUE outage tracking system was capable of tracking controllable interruptions for 1999 and 2000.

II. Customer Satisfaction Survey

Generally speaking, our customers considered AmerenUE to be a good provider of reliable electric service at a cost comparable to other electric service providers as evidenced by our annual customer survey. A synopsis of the results of this survey are detailed in Attachment A. The entire survey will be submitted electronically.

[411.120 b) 3) G) v)]

III. Distribution and Transmission Facilities Financial Information

- A. Nearly all Distribution and Transmission expenditures have an impact towards maintaining or improving reliability. AmerenUE plans to make the following expenditures in 2001 and the next 3 years, 2002-2004. Also included are the actual 1999, and 2000 expenditures.

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Distribution	\$11,234,000	\$12,622,000	\$14,509,000	\$13,364,000	\$13,228,000	\$13,459,000
Transmission	\$2,627,000	\$2,550,000	\$2,483,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,514,000	\$2,441,000
Expenditures are in constant 1998 dollars.						

These values are also included on Attachment B where these values are compared to our Distribution and Transmission Plant investment and average remaining depreciation lives. [411.120 b) 3) G) iii) & iv)]

Actual 2000 distribution expenditures deviated from planned expenditures due to 2000 storm related expenses of about \$120,000, increased transportation expenditures of about \$230,000, and contractor support of almost \$200,000 for governmental relocations along Seminary Road. The remaining deviations are due to increased wage cost data in our updated corporate budget estimating model and miscellaneous budget variations.

Planned distribution expenses for year 2001 increased more than \$1,000,000 because of increased tree trimming expenditures in 2001, increased nearly \$300,000 because of increased expenditures in the Pole Inspection Program, and increased almost \$100,000 for the purchase of a site for a future distribution substation. The remaining deviations are due to miscellaneous variations.

Future planned distribution expenses for years 2002 and beyond increased more than \$1,000,000 because of increased tree trimming expenditures, and increased nearly \$200,000 because of increased expenditures in the Pole Inspection Program. The remaining deviations are due to miscellaneous variations.

The 2001-2004 transmission expenditures are planned to be nearly equivalent to the actual 2000 expenditures.

Included as Attachment C are the relevant characteristics of each operating area and a qualitative assessment of the equipment and facilities in each operating area.

[411.120 b) 3) G) i)]

- B. There are numerous operating practices performed at AmerenUE which are performed on a periodic basis that do have direct bearing upon reliability. Nearly all of these activities are performed to allow AmerenUE to identify problems and potentially prevent customer interruptions from occurring. These practices will not be identified as specific reliability projects. Some of the more important ones are noted below:
1. Periodic Substation Inspections
 2. Infra-red Scanning Substations on Periodic Basis
 3. Substation and Relay Equipment Maintenance and Testing on Periodic Basis
 4. Line Inspections on a Periodic Basis
 5. Installation of Animal Protective Guards in Susceptible Areas
 6. Periodic Review of System Reliability and System Loadings

C. Specific Reliability Projects [411.120 b) 3) A) iii) iv) viii)

AmerenUE does consider the effects on customers and the cost of reducing the number of planned and unplanned interruptions in our reliability projects.

1. Aerial Sub-transmission Infrared Inspection - The present plan is to perform an aerial inspection of the sub-transmission system on a 3-year cycle. This project enables AmerenUE to identify and fix problems (loose connections, weak splices, air break switches, etc.) before any interruptions might actually occur. The sub-transmission circuits were not scheduled for inspection in 2000. About \$25,000 was spent in 2000 completing several of the items identified during the 1999 inspection. Nineteen hotspots (some were on distribution circuits) were identified in 1999, from primarily deteriorated connections.

As recommended in the 1998 Reliability Assessment report, AmerenUE is currently analyzing the costs and benefits of a distribution line infrared inspection. Six circuits are scheduled to be inspected during the 2nd quarter 2001. A report on our findings should be available 3rd quarter 2001.

2. Worst Performing Feeders - From outage information, the worst performing feeders are identified annually. The worst performing feeders list is developed based on the previous year's historical performance and cannot be specifically projected into the future. There is a formalized reporting process to ensure that proper steps are taken in the problem analysis and remediation identification processes. The evaluation criteria for determining these are not strictly determined from CAIFI, SAIDI, or CAIFI. AmerenUE-Illinois did not have any Company Worst Performing feeders in 2000. In 1999, AmerenUE-Illinois spent approximately \$260,000 on the worst performing feeder to re-insulate a sub-transmission line and split the line into two circuits which reduced the overhead exposure by 7 miles to the customers.
3. Lightning Protection - Identification of where lightning protection enhancement projects can provide major benefits will continue. The lightning protection projects list is developed based on the previous 3-year's historical performance and recommendations by the district. Approximately \$1000 was spent in 2000 on improving lightning protection on the Ridge-Lake-T1 sub-transmission circuit by repairing, installing or replacing static wire ground connections. Additional work scheduled on this circuit should be complete by June 30, 2001.
4. Pole Inspection and Treatment - Data collected in the first phase of the sub-transmission and distribution backbone inspection will be analyzed to evaluate such things as percent of poles that failed test, percent reinforcement, etc. By performing this inspection, we will be able to identify and replace or repair poles that might otherwise fail and result in unplanned customer interruptions. This is an on-going reliability project. Approximately \$85,000 was spent in 2000 on inspecting about 1000 poles, pole treatment and pole replacement.
5. URD Cable Replacement – Cable failures are recorded and cables are replaced when specific failure criteria are exceeded. AmerenUE-Illinois did not have any cable failures that exceeded the failure criteria in 2000.

6. Annual Tree Trimming – Trimming distribution and transmission circuits will continue on a periodic cycle. The crews use “natural” tree trimming methods that are intended to direct future tree growth away from power lines. Approximately \$1,554,000 was spent in 2000 on tree trimming. Approximately 23 circuits were tree trimmed in 2000. As reported to the Commission on December 6, 2000, all AmerenUE-Illinois distribution circuits will be back on a four year trimming cycle by June 30, 2002.

Capital expenditures for the above identified programs are budgeted and prioritized based on an ABB-developed modeling process. This process provides a consistent method for identifying those programs that will provide the highest reliability benefit for capital dollars expended. The ranking is based on a “dollars per KVA-hour saved” which ensures that maintenance capital expenditures are optimized across the corporation. All of the above programs have been shown to have very low costs for the anticipated reliability gain. As part of a new reliability initiative underway at Ameren, actual reliability impacts (SAIFI, CAIDI reductions) of these programs and others are being analyzed.

D. Unresolved Reliability Complaints

AmerenUE has no unresolved reliability complaints from other entities.

[411.120 b) 3) A) v)]

IV. Interruption Information

A. Number and Duration of Planned and Unplanned Interruptions for 2000 and 1999

The impact on customers of planned and unplanned interruptions are inconveniences to the customer since they have no electricity during the interruption.

	# of Interruptions	Duration
Planned Interruptions – 2000	349	452 hours
Planned Interruptions – 1999	394	523 hours
Planned Interruptions – 1998	255	477 hours
Unplanned Interruptions – 2000	2,191	12,120 hours
Unplanned Interruptions – 1999	2,162	5,966 hours
Unplanned Interruptions – 1998	3,147	20,865 hours

[411.120 b) 3) C)]

The August 17, 2000, storm produced wind and tree damage causing about 10,000 customers to be without power. In 1998, several major storms occurred causing most of the customer interruptions. The June 14, 1998 thunderstorm caused massive tree and wind damage causing about 31,000 customers to be without power. The July 22, 1998 thunderstorm caused outages to about 23,000 customers.

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

B. Number and Causes of Controllable Interruptions for 2000

CAUSES	# OF INTERRUPTIONS	% TOTAL INTERRUPTION
Other Alternative Retail Electric Supplier	0	0
Jurisdictional Entity / Contractor Personnel- Errors	16	3.8
Customer	0	0
Public	0	0
Weather Related	0	0
Animal Related	0	0
Tree Related	101	24.0
Overhead Equipment Related	3	0.7
Underground Equipment Related	0	0
Intentional	298	70.8
Transmission and Substation Related	0	0
Unknown	2	0.5
Other	1	0.2

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Number and Causes of Controllable Interruptions for 1999

CAUSES	# OF INTERRUPTIONS	% TOTAL INTERRUPTION
Other Alternative Retail Electric Supplier	0	0
Jurisdictional Entity / Contractor Personnel- Errors	27	5.6
Customer	0	0
Public	0	0
Weather Related	0	0
Animal Related	0	0
Tree Related	101	21.0
Overhead Equipment Related	0	0
Underground Equipment Related	2	0.4
Intentional	351	73.0
Transmission and Substation Related	0	0
Unknown	0	0
Other	0	0

Number and Causes of Controllable Interruptions for 1998:

AmerenUE was unable to track controllable interruptions for 1998.

[411.120 b) 3) D)]

C. Number of Interruptions Due to Other Electric Supplier

AmerenUE had no customer service interruptions due to another electric supplier in 1998, 1999, nor 2000.

[411.120 b) 3) E)]

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

D. Comparison of Interruption Frequency and Duration for Customers with Alternative Electric Supplier

As of December 31, 2001, only 12 AmerenUE customers purchased electric energy from an alternative supplier. The CAIDI was 95.5 and CAIFI was 1.20 for these customers in 2000. These indices are slightly better than the AmerenUE system CAIDI and CAIFI reported in section V (A.) of this report. This shows that we treated all customers equally, regardless of where they purchased their electric energy.

[411.120 b) 3) F)]

V. Service Reliability Information – Company Wide

A. AmerenUE experienced the following SAIFI, CAIDI and CAIFI reliability indices:

DISTRICT	SAIFI	CAIDI	CAIFI
Illinois – 2000	1.14	219 minutes	1.91
Illinois – 1999	1.55	169 minutes	2.24
Illinois – 1998	2.23	519 minutes	N/A

CAIFI index is not available for 1998.

[411.120 b) 3) H)]

The August 17, 2000, storm produced wind and tree damage causing about 10,000 customers to be without power. In 1998, several major storms occurred causing most of the customer interruptions. The June 14, 1998 thunderstorm caused massive tree and wind damage leaving about 31,000 customers to be without power. The July 22, 1998 thunderstorm caused outages to about 23,000 customers.

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

- B. Below is a summary of the interruptions by Cause Category experienced by AmerenUE for 2000.
(Format changed to outage duration per interruption cause per ICC):

CAUSES	# OF INTER- RUPTIONS	% TOTAL INTER- RUPTIONS	DURATION (minutes)	% DURATION
Other Alternative Retail Electric Supplier	0	0	0	0
Jurisdictional Entity / Contractor Personnel- Errors	31	1.2	2766	0.4
Customer	69	2.7	13368	1.8
Public	163	6.4	24078	3.2
Weather Related	697	27.5	503256	66.8
Animal Related	7	0.3	1140	0.2
Tree Related	403	15.9	78198	10.4
Overhead Equipment Related	466	18.4	66696	8.9
Underground Equipment Related	32	1.3	7710	1.0
Intentional	326	12.8	24444	3.2
Transmission and Substation Related	6	0.2	606	0.1
Unknown	272	10.7	25380	3.4
Other	66	2.6	5496	0.7

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Below is a summary of the interruptions by Cause Category experienced by AmerenUE for 1999:

CAUSES	# OF INTER- RUPTIONS	% TOTAL INTER- RUPTIONS	CUSTOMER MINUTES OUT	% CUSTOMER MINUTES OUT
Other Alternative Retail Electric Supplier	0	0	0	0
Jurisdictional Entity / Contractor Personnel- Errors	48	1.9	19585	0.1
Customer	84	3.3	91159	0.5
Public	104	4.1	549909	3.3
Weather Related	448	17.5	8526487	50.5
Animal Related	7	0.3	12589	0.1
Tree Related	334	13.1	1049867	6.2
Overhead Equipment Related	523	20.5	3322813	19.7
Underground Equipment Related	32	1.3	113758	0.7
Intentional	372	14.6	322271	1.9
Transmission and Substation Related	24	0.9	1028008	6.1
Unknown	438	17.1	610615	3.6
Other	141	5.5	1231356	7.3

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Below is a summary of the interruptions by Cause Category experienced by AmerenUE for 1998:

CAUSES	# OF INTER- RUPTIONS	% TOTAL INTER- RUPTIONS	CUSTOMER MINUTES OUT	% CUSTOMER MINUTES OUT
Other Alternative Retail Electric Supplier	0	0	0	0
Jurisdictional Entity / Contractor Personnel- Errors	64	1.9	56492	0.1
Customer	68	2.0	53544	0.1
Public	68	2.0	194780	0.3
Weather Related	1413	41.5	66557653	91.2
Animal Related	8	0.2	18631	0.1
Tree Related	312	9.2	1593334	2.2
Overhead Equipment Related	771	22.7	3550653	4.9
Underground Equipment Related	23	0.7	168573	0.2
Intentional	208	6.1	222959	0.3
Transmission and Substation Related	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unknown	380	11.2	467674	0.6
Other	87	2.6	86055	0.1

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Below is a summary of the interruptions by Cause Category experienced by AmerenUE for 1997:

CAUSES	# OF INTER- RUPTIONS	% TOTAL INTER- RUPTIONS	CUSTOMER MINUTES OUT	% CUSTOMER MINUTES OUT
Other Alternative Retail Electric Supplier	0	0	0	0
Jurisdictional Entity / Contractor Personnel- Errors	42	2.5	12276	0.3
Customer	47	2.8	10626	0.2
Public	73	4.3	241699	5.3
Weather Related	327	19.4	1629558	35.6
Animal Related	4	0.2	8738	0.2
Tree Related	189	11.2	594643	13.0
Overhead Equipment Related	548	32.5	1188532	25.9
Underground Equipment Related	29	1.7	136803	3.0
Intentional	159	9.4	525775	11.5
Transmission and Substation Related	1	0.0	678	0.0
Unknown	241	14.3	193565	4.2
Other	28	1.7	37783	0.8

[411.120 b) 3) G) ii)]

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

C. AmerenUE received the following service reliability complaints for 2000.

Date	Location (ICC case # if applicable)	Complaint	Resolution
12/15/00	609 S. 31 st Street Centreville, IL (ICC # 2000-37683S)	Customer states she has had 5 outages in 2000. Power off again today.	Discussed outage history with customer. Explained to customer and ICC the outages were non-recurring random problems.
10/13/00	124 Prairie Ln Alton, IL (ICC # 2000-31204s)	Customer says for 2yrs they have experienced service going off & on Sometimes for hours and other times flickering. Said company was out and did work but condition getting worse.	Tree problems, hot spot trimmed. Entire circuit trimmed 1 st quarter 2001. Additional tap fusing to be installed 2 nd quarter 2001.

For 1999, AmerenUE had five ICC service reliability complaints.

For 1998 and 1997, AmerenUE had no ICC service reliability complaints.

[411.120 b) 3) G) vi)]

VI. Service Reliability Information – Operating Areas

A. AmerenUE operating area's qualitative characteristics are included as Attachment C.

B. Listed below are AmerenUE worst-performing distribution circuits when ranked by SAIFI , CAIDI, and CAIFI indices for 2000:

Feeder circuit	SAIFI
302-001	4.2
334-001	3.4

Feeder circuit	CAIDI
325-010	2006
343-002	1042

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Feeder circuit	CAIFI
302-001	4.2
349-003	4.0

For 302-001 CAIFI set equal to SAIFI

Listed below are AmerenUE worst-performing distribution circuits when ranked by SAIFI , CAIDI, and CAIFI indices for 1999, along with their indices for 2000:

Feeder circuit	SAIFI 1999	SAIFI 2000
341-003	3.4	2.9
310-052	3.3	1.7

Feeder circuit	CAIDI 1999	CAIDI 2000
374-052	601	332
308-002	585	151

Feeder circuit	CAIFI 1999	CAIFI 2000
310-052	3.3	2.1
374-069	3.1	2.8

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Listed below are AmerenUE worst-performing distribution circuits when ranked by SAIFI , CAIDI, and CAIFI indices for 1998:

Feeder circuit	SAIFI
342-003	6.1
328-002	5.7

Feeder circuit	CAIDI
305-002	3254
330-003	3153

Feeder circuit	CAIFI
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

[411.120 b) 3) I)]

VII. Operating & Maintenance History of Worst-Performing Circuits with Action Plans

[411.120 b) 3) J)]

Feeder circuit 302-001

Location/Area Served

This circuit serves commercial and residential area near 17th and Lincoln in East St. Louis and east of Route 203 in Madison.

Outage History

There were 10 outages affecting various sections of this distribution feeder. There were three outages related to bad weather, and four outages caused by tree related contacts, one outage caused by broken pole, three failed switches, one fuse blown with unknown cause, and one unknown.

Actions Taken or Planned

For the tree related outages, the trees were cleared. For the pole broken outage, the pole was replaced. For the switch failures, the switches were replaced or repaired.

Planned actions include installation of additional fused tap switches and resizing of several existing fuses. The trees along this circuit were trimmed in the 1st quarter 2001.

Approximate cost of actions (excluding planned trimming): \$ 9,100

Feeder circuit 334-001

Location/Area Served

This circuit serves commercial and residential area near 24th and Market in East St. Louis.

Outage History

There were 13 outages that occurred affecting various sections of this distribution feeder. There were eight outages related to bad weather and four outages caused by tree related contacts (fallen or broken trees or limbs). There was one outage caused when feeder breaker tripped for unknown cause, three outages caused by wires down, one outage caused by broken pole, three outages caused by transformer failures, and two outages were due to equipment failure.

Actions Taken or Planned

For the tree related outages, the trees were cleared. For the pole broken outage, the pole was replaced. For the downed wire outages, the wires were repaired or replaced. For the transformer failures, the transformer were replaced or repaired. For the equipment failures, the equipment was repaired or replaced and service was restored.

Planned actions include installation of additional fused tap switches, resizing of several existing fuses, and replacement of three solid switches with fuses. The trees along this circuit were trimmed in 4th quarter 1999.

Approximate cost of actions (excluding planned trimming): \$ 8,400

Feeder circuit 325-010

Location/Area Served

This circuit serves commercial and residential area near Highway 159 and Belle in Fairview Heights.

Outage History

There were four outages that occurred affecting various sections of this distribution feeder. There were two outages related to the major storm that occurred August 17, 2000. This storm produced extremely high winds, causing broken and fallen trees, broken poles and wires down. This storm resulted in 132 customers on this circuit being out of power for about 37 hours. The other two outages were due to an underground cable failure and a transformer failure.

Actions Taken or Planned

For the storm related outages, the damage was repaired and service restored. For the transformer failure, the transformer was repaired. For the cable failure, the failed section was replaced.

No additional actions are planned for this circuit. The trees along this circuit are scheduled to be trimmed in the 2nd quarter 2001.

Approximate cost of actions (excluding planned trimming): \$ 8,000

Feeder circuit 343-002

Location/Area Served

This circuit serves primarily residential areas near South Ruby and Longacre in Fairview Heights.

Outage History

There were two outages that occurred affecting various sections of this distribution feeder. There was one outage related to the major storm that occurred August 17, 2000. This storm produced extremely high winds, causing broken and fallen trees, broken poles and wires down. This storm resulted in 12 customers on this circuit being out of power for about 27 hours. There was one other outage caused by a transformer failure.

Actions Taken or Planned

For the storm related outage, the damage was repaired and service restored. For the transformer failure, the transformer replaced.

No additional actions are planned for this circuit. The trees along this circuit are scheduled to be trimmed in the 4th quarter 2001.

Approximate cost of actions (excluding planned trimming): \$ 2000

Feeder circuit 349-003

Location/Area Served

This circuit serves commercial and residential area near Summit and 47th in East St Louis.

Outage History

There were a total of four outages that occurred affecting this distribution feeder. All these outages were related to the same transformer.

Actions Taken or Planned

The problems were due to old HVAC and refrigeration equipment being started and tripping out the transformer fuses. The issue was discussed with the property owner and load information was discussed, the transformer was replaced with a larger unit.

No additional actions are planned. The trees along this circuit are scheduled to be trimmed in the 2nd quarter 2001.

Approximate cost of actions (excluding planned trimming): \$ 5,800

VIII. Report on Action Plans for 1999 Worst-Performing circuits

Feeder circuit 341-003

Actions Taken or Planned

As stated in the 1999 report; for the overhead equipment failures, the fuses were replaced, the wires were repaired and the failed transformers were replaced. For the tree related outages, the trees were cleared. For the public vehicle damage outage, the pole and wires were replaced. The planned actions included the installation of four sets of fused switches and the repair of a broken guy wire, which was completed during the 2nd quarter 2000. The trees along this circuit were trimmed in the 4th quarter 2000.

In addition, this circuit is being inspected during 2nd quarter of 2001 to identify and replace some broken or deteriorated poles in accordance with the March 2001 response to the ICC.

Feeder circuit 310-052

Actions Taken or Planned

As stated in the 1999 report; for the overhead equipment failures, the wires were repaired, a failed capacitor bank was replaced, and the failed transformers were replaced with larger transformers. Lightning arrestor protection was installed on the single 34kv supply to the substation and on the backbone of this circuit. In 1999, trees along circuit were hot spot trimmed for reliability. The trees along this circuit were trimmed in 1st quarter 2001. The planned actions included two additional sets of disconnect switches installed, two recloser installations upgraded, and fuses upgraded at two locations, which were completed during the 2nd quarter 2001.

In addition, this circuit is being inspected during 2nd quarter of 2001 to identify and replace some broken or deteriorated poles in accordance with the March 2001 response to the ICC.

Feeder circuit 374-052

Actions Taken or Planned

As stated in the 1999 report: the broken pole was replaced and service was restored. No additional work was planned.

Feeder circuit 308-002

Actions Taken or Planned

As stated in the 1999 report; the broken pole was replaced and service was restored. No additional work was planned.

Feeder circuit 374-069

Actions Taken or Planned

As stated in the 1999 report; for the tree related outages, the trees were cleared. For the animal outage, the snake was removed. For the public vehicle damage outages, the pole and wires were repaired and/or replaced. For the overhead equipment failures, the wires were repaired. Other actions taken included installation of additional fuse switches, installation of additional sectionalizing switches, and repair of miscellaneous items on a 1.2 mile section of circuit. The planned actions included the installation of three fused switches and replacement of three existing solid switches with fused switches, which was completed during the 2nd quarter 2000.

IX. Company Contact

For further information regarding this report, contact:

Arthur E. Curle

District Manager

AmerenUE

500 E. Broadway

East St. Louis, Illinois 62201

Attachment A – Customer Satisfaction Survey

2000 Customer satisfaction survey

In 1998, under Illinois Administrative Code 411, “Electric Reliability,” the Illinois Commerce Commission (ICC) adopted a customer survey requirement. The ICC initiated a rulemaking to design and approve a single customer survey, addressing both the residential and non-residential sectors, applicable to each Illinois Jurisdictional Entity. This synopsis provides an overview of the results of the year 2000 survey effort for AmerenUE-Illinois. The survey, which involved 600 residential customer and 380 non-residential customers, addressed the following topics as required by ICC rules: overall satisfaction; reliability performance; customer service performance; understanding of services; tree trimming performance; billing; and demographics/firmographics. The surveys were completed between October 24, 2000 and December 6, 2000. The residential portion has an overall confidence interval of ± 4.0 percent at the 95 percent confidence level while the non-residential portion has an overall confidence interval of ± 4.9 percent at the 95 percent confidence level. The survey consisted mostly of three question types: rating questions; yes/no questions; and categorical questions. Key findings by sector and question type are summarized below. The entire 2000 Customer satisfaction survey will be submitted electronically.

Residential

Rating Questions. All rating questions use a zero to 10 scale where zero means the utility is doing a poor job and 10 means the utility is doing an excellent job. Overall research findings, ordered from highest to lowest mean rating, for questions asked of all residential survey respondents are outlined below:

- ?? Providing reliable electric service (mean = 8.54)
- ?? Providing electric service overall (mean = 8.50)
- ?? Keeping the electric system in good working order (mean = 8.39)
- ?? Restoring electric service at your residence when outages occur (mean = 8.04)
- ?? Minimizing the number of power interruptions lasting LESS than one minute (mean = 7.99)
- ?? Minimizing the number of power outages lasting MORE than one minute (mean = 7.93)
- ?? Being accessible during an outage (mean = 7.31)
- ?? Providing information about extended outages (mean = 7.02)
- ?? Keeping electric rates reasonable (mean = 6.59)

Yes/No Questions. Overall research findings, ordered from highest to lowest percentage of “yes” responses, for questions asked of all residential survey respondents are outlined below:

- ?? Respondents who receive a bill from the utility at this location (percent “yes” = 99.0 percent)
- ?? Respondents who tried to reach the utility by phone in the past 12 months (percent “yes” = 49.3 percent)
- ?? Respondents who experienced any loss or damage due to electrical outages or other electrical problems (percent “yes” = 8.2 percent)

Categorical Questions. While a number of categorical questions are included in the survey, those addressing familiarity with various utility services (ordered from most familiar to least familiar) are outlined below:

- ?? Being available 24 hours a day, seven days a week by phone in the event of a power outage (percent “very familiar” = 63.3 percent)
- ?? Having a toll-free number to report power outages (percent “very familiar” = 61.6 percent)
- ?? Offering different bill payment options to qualified customers (percent “very familiar” = 59.6 percent)
- ?? Trimming trees to reduce the occurrence of power outages (percent “very familiar” = 43.7 percent)
- ?? Reporting information about extended power outages to the news media to keep customers informed (percent “very familiar” = 24.7 percent)

Non-Residential

Rating Questions. All rating questions use a zero to 10 scale where zero means the utility is doing a poor job and 10 means the utility is doing an excellent job. Overall research findings, ordered from highest to lowest mean rating, for questions asked of all non-residential survey respondents are outlined below:

- ?? Providing reliable electric service (mean = 8.55)
- ?? Providing electric service overall (mean = 8.35)
- ?? Keeping the electric system in good working order (mean = 8.34)
- ?? Minimizing the number of power interruptions lasting LESS than one minute (mean = 8.28)
- ?? Minimizing the number of power outages lasting MORE than one minute (mean = 8.26)
- ?? Restoring electric service at your business when outages occur (mean = 7.95)
- ?? Being accessible during an outage (mean = 7.32)
- ?? Providing information about extended outages (mean = 7.00)
- ?? Keeping electric rates reasonable (mean = 6.63)

Yes/No Questions. Overall research findings, ordered from highest to lowest percentage of “yes” responses, for questions asked of all non-residential survey respondents are outlined below:

- ?? Respondents who receive a bill from the utility at this location (percent “yes” = 85.2 percent)
- ?? Respondents who tried to reach the utility by phone in the past 12 months (percent “yes” = 56.0 percent)
- ?? Respondents who experienced any loss or damage due to electrical outages or other electrical problems (percent “yes” = 19.9 percent)

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Categorical Questions. While a number of categorical questions are included in the survey, those addressing familiarity with various utility services (ordered from most familiar to least familiar) are outlined below:

- ?? Being available 24 hours a day, seven days a week by phone in the event of a power outage (percent “very familiar” = 73.7 percent)
- ?? Having a toll-free number to report power outages (percent “very familiar” = 68.1 percent)
- ?? Offering different bill payment options to qualified customers (percent “very familiar” = 54.0 percent)
- ?? Trimming trees to reduce the occurrence of power outages (percent “very familiar” = 53.7 percent)
- ?? Reporting information about extended power outages to the news media to keep customers informed (percent “very familiar” = 27.2 percent)

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

1999 Customer satisfaction survey

Commercial & Industrial (C&I) AmerenUE Illinois Customers – 27 customers surveyed
Residential AmerenUE Illinois Customers – 144 customers surveyed

I would like to know how you rate your electric company overall on a scale of “1” to “7”, where “1” means “very unfavorable” and “7” means “very favorable.” The more favorable you generally feel toward your electric company, the higher the number you would give.

	Very unfavorable					Very (Don't favorable know)		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	4%	4	0	15	38	10	25	4
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	3%	1	3	12	28	19	32	2

Based on what you have seen or heard about the price of electricity around the country, how does the price you pay for electricity compare to what other pay?

1. Much more expensive than others
2. Somewhat more expensive than others
3. About the same price as others
4. Somewhat less expensive than others
5. Much less expensive than others
6. (Don't know)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	4%	22	41	10	1	22

Now I'm going to read you a list of things that people may expect from their electric company. As I mention each thing, I'd like you to tell me how well you think your electric company performs in this area using a scale of “1” to “7,” where “1” is “poor” and “7” is “excellent.”

Employees who are understanding and courteous, and help customers when they have questions or problems.

	Poor					(Don't Excellent know)		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	10%	9	4	6	23	17	30	0
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	5%	3	2	9	13	17	47	5

Providing reliable, high quality service without frequent interruptions.

	Poor					(Don't Excellent know)		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	4%	0	4	4	35	26	26	0
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	2%	3	2	6	17	27	42	0

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Restoring service quickly after a service interruption

	Poor					Excellent		(Don't know)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	0%	17	1	17	20	13	30	0
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	3%	1	4	10	22	19	40	1

Billing statements that are easy to understand and provide useful information

	Poor					Excellent		(Don't know)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	4%	4	4	0	30	32	25	0
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	2%	1	6	8	14	21	47	2

Responding to customer inquiries promptly and efficiently

	Poor					Excellent		(Don't know)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	4%	15	1	14	32	13	20	0
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	2%	3	11	8	15	20	38	3

Offering programs and services to help customers control their energy use and the amount of their bills

	Poor					Excellent		(Don't know)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	9%	17	6	17	24	6	16	4
Residential not surveyed on this question								

Working hard to keep rates as low as possible

	Poor					Excellent		(Don't know)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	17%	6	10	17	12	4	14	19
Residential not surveyed on this question								

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Providing energy that is consistent, without power surges or variations in quality

	Poor					Excellent		(Don't know)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	4%	4	10	9	24	24	23	0
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	1%	2	3	9	16	29	38	1

Doing preventative maintenance, including tree trimming and maintaining lines and equipment

	Poor					Excellent		(Don't know)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	9%	4	1	11	36	15	19	4
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	10%	5	3	10	16	16	33	6

Planning for the future reliability of electric service to meet the needs of the area

	Poor					Excellent		(Don't know)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	9%	4	4	12	16	14	17	23
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	2%	2	3	10	18	19	26	19

Thinking of your most recent contact, what was your reason for contacting the company?

01. (Question about a bill size)
02. (Arrange extended payment/Avoid service cutoff)
03. (Question an estimated bill)
04. (Check/test meter equipment)
05. (Specific service/repair request)
06. (Moved/Changed address)
07. (Inquiry about a program)
08. (Interruption of power/Problem with electricity)
09. (No bill received)
10. (New service installation)
11. (General inquiry)
12. (Other)
13. (Don't know)

	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	13.
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	29%	0	0	0	15	0	0	39	0	7	0	10	0
Residential not surveyed													

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Which of the following best describes your most recent contact with your electric company or its employees?

1. I called the company with a request or problem
2. I received a call from the company about a new program or service
3. The company called me to follow up on a problem or request
4. The company left a note at my home
5. (Other)
6. (Don't know)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	80%	4	4	2	5	5

Specifically, why did you contact your electric company?

1. (Power outage)
2. (Question on billing)
3. (Credit/collection problems)
4. (Question about Ameren)
5. (Energy conservation)
6. (Change/update account information)
7. (Meter/Meter reading)
8. (Other)*
9. (Don't know)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	44%	27	2	0	0	2	4	20	0

Overall, how satisfied were you with the way your inquiry or request was handled? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not very satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Not very satisfied
4. Not satisfied at all
5. (Don't know)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
C&I AmerenUE Overall 1999	42%	34	15	10	0
Residential AmerenUE Overall 1999	63%	23	4	9	2

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

1998 customer satisfaction survey

Commercial & Industrial (C&I) AmerenUE Illinois Customers – 35 customers surveyed

Residential AmerenUE Illinois Customers – 165 customers surveyed

I would like to know how you rate your electric company overall on a scale of “1” to “7”, where “1” means “very unfavorable” and “7” means “very favorable.” The more favorable you generally feel toward your electric company, the higher the number you would give.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Don't Know
C&I	0%	0%	3%	6%	32%	36%	19%	3%
Residential	2%	5%	3%	8%	26%	17%	38%	1%

Based on what you have seen or heard about the price of electricity around the country, how does the price you pay for electricity compare to what other pay?

		C&I	Residential
1.	Much more expensive than others	0%	5%
2.	Somewhat more expensive than others	19%	14%
3.	About the same price as others	25%	30%
4.	Somewhat less expensive than others	13%	23%
5.	Much less expensive than others	0%	3%
6.	(Don't know)	43%	25%

Now I'm going to read you a list of things that people may expect from their electric company. As I mention each thing, I'd like you to tell me how well you think your electric company performs in this area using a scale of “1” to “7,” where “1” is “poor” and “7” is “excellent.”

Employees who are understanding and courteous, and help customers when they have questions or problems.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Don't Know
C&I	0%	0%	3%	17%	28%	30%	19%	3%
Residential	5%	2%	3%	8%	16%	26%	31%	9%

Providing reliable, high quality service without frequent interruptions.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Don't Know
C&I	3%	0%	3%	6%	15%	36%	37%	0%
Residential	1%	1%	4%	6%	16%	23%	46%	2%

Restoring service quickly after a service interruption

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Don't Know
C&I	3%	0%	3%	6%	38%	22%	25%	3%
Residential	3%	2%	4%	10%	12%	28%	37%	4%

Billing statements that are easy to understand and provide useful information

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Don't Know
C&I	0%	3%	6%	3%	22%	40%	26%	0%
Residential	1%	2%	5%	9%	15%	20%	47%	1%

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Responding to customer inquiries promptly and efficiently

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Don't Know
C&I	3%	0	3%	9%	36%	24%	19%	6%
Residential	1%	1%	5%	8%	22%	20%	37%	6%

Offering programs and services to help customers control their energy use and the amount of their bills

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Don't Know
C&I	9%	6%	9%	13%	34%	12%	13%	3%
Residential	not surveyed on this question							

Working hard to keep rates as low as possible

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Don't Know
C&I	6%	10%	9%	21%	15%	9%	3%	26%
Residential	not surveyed on this question							

How many times in the past year have you lost power?

	C&I	Residential
1. Once	24%	not surveyed on this question.
2. Twice	32%	
3. Three times	17%	
4. Four times	3%	
5. Five times	0%	
6. Six times	6%	
7. Seven times	0%	
8. Eight times	0%	
9. Nine times	0%	
10. Ten or more times	0%	
11. None	15%	
12. Don't know	3%	

C&I -Thinking of your most recent contact, what was your reason for contacting the company?

	C&I
1. Question about a bill size	14%
2. Arrange extended payment/Avoid service cutoff	0%
3. Question an estimated bill	0%
4. Check/test meter equipment	0%
5. Specific service/repair request	6%
6. Moved/Changed address	6%
7. Inquiry about a program	0%
8. Interruption of power/Problem with electricity	44%
9. No bill received	0%
10. New service installation	6%
11. General inquiry	6%
12. Other	17%
13. Don't know	0%

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Residential – Which of the following best describes your most recent contact with your electric company or its employees?

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. I called the company with a request or problem | 83% |
| 2. I received a call from the company about a new program or service | 2% |
| 3. The company called me to follow up on a problem or request | 5% |
| 4. The company left a note at my home | 0% |
| 5. (other) | 6% |
| 6. (Don't know) | 4% |

Residential – Specifically, why did you contact your electric company?

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Power Outage | 43% |
| 2. Question on billing | 21% |
| 3. Credit/collection problems | 5% |
| 4. Question about Ameren | 0% |
| 5. Energy conservation | 0% |
| 6. Change/update account information | 5% |
| 7. Meter/Meter reading | 2% |
| 8. Other | 25% |
| 9. Don't know | 0% |

Overall, how satisfied were you with the way your inquiry or request was handled? Were you satisfied, not very satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

- | | C&I | Residential |
|-------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 1. Very satisfied | 64% | 57% |
| 2. Somewhat satisfied | 24% | 29% |
| 3. Not very satisfied | 6% | 2% |
| 4. Not satisfied at all | 6% | 12% |
| 5. Don't know | 0% | 0% |

1997 Customer satisfaction survey

AmerenUE did not survey only Illinois customers during 1997. Both Illinois and Missouri customers were surveyed together. Therefore, a comparison is not available.

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Attachment B – Distribution and Transmission Plant

Listed below is the 2000 Transmission and Distribution report listing the age of the facilities, the ratio of the expenditures to investment and the average remaining depreciation lives of the facilities. Format changed as requested in docket 01-134.

AmerenUE - Illinois Transmission Plant

Acct	Description	Plant In-Service 12/31/00	Average Age ⁽¹⁾	Remaining Depreciable Life ⁽²⁾
350	Land and Land Rights	2,584,108.65	45.1	
352	Substation Structures	1,107,207.60	31.4	47.6
353	Substation Equipment	30,909,304.95	24.9	25.1
354	Towers and Fixtures	17,645,394.53	30.8	19.2
355	Poles and Fixtures	4,412,672.61	27.6	15.4
356	Overhead Conductor and Devices	12,541,955.90	25.0	35.0
359	Roads and Trails	62,248.00	87.5	47.5

⁽¹⁾ The average of age of facilities was determined by using aged plant-in-service balances

⁽²⁾ Transmission land is not depreciated and land rights are amortized at a rate of 1%

Total Transmission Plant In-Service \$69,262,892.24

AmerenUE-Illinois Distribution Plant

	Average Age Years	Remaining Life Years	Life 0 to 10 Years	Life 11 to 20 Years	Life 21 to 30 Years	Life 31 to 40 Years	Life > 40 Years
Structures and Improvements	34.9	26.1	0	157,149	87,776	106,407	168,776
Station Equipment	26.2	17.8	4,018,746	1,454,786	4,216,462	4,894,605	3,379,106
Poles, Towers and Fixtures	18.3	15.7	12,202,874	7,752,580	5,855,530	5,717,803	2,153,799
Overhead conductors and Devices	17.1	18.9	16,170,602	9,900,414	6,003,108	4,495,344	3,262,626
Underground Conduit	27.5	56.5	756,649	220,854	298,772	409,497	642,137
Underground Conductor and Devices	16.8	28.2	4,986,173	2,411,539	1,483,759	616,877	1,224,876
Line Transformers	30.4	9.6	2,716,027	1,226,797	1,964,265	2,305,243	5,322,614
Services Overhead	19.9	16.1	1,553,991	2,999,103	1,529,111	1,131,563	1,001,982
Services Underground	11.0	34.0	1,598,890	738,448	380,248	67,045	46,741
Installation at Customer Premises	27.2	18.8	0	4,390	59,919	52,171	2,416

Total Distribution Plant In-Service \$146,200,346.15

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

2000 Transmission Expenditures *	\$2,550,000
Transmission Investment	\$69,262,892
Ratio of Transmission Expenditures to Transmission Investment	0.04

2000 Distribution Expenditures *	\$12,622,000
Distribution Investment	\$146,200,346
Ratio of Distribution Expenditures to Distribution Investment	0.09

(* expenditures are in 1998 dollars)

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Listed below is the facility plant report for 1999.

AmerenUE Illinois Transmission Plant

<u>Description</u>	<u>Average Age (1)</u>	<u>Remaining Depreciable Life</u>	<u>Total Depreciation</u>	<u>(A) %</u>
Land and Land Rights	(3)	(2)		
Substation Structures	(3)	(3)		
Substation Equipment	28.4	21.6	50.0	43.20%
Towers and Fixtures	29.8	20.2	50.0	40.40%
Poles and Fixtures	28.2	14.8	43.0	34.42%
Overhead Conductor and Devices	23.9	36.1	60.0	60.17%
Roads and Trails	86.5	48.5	135.0	35.93%

Total Plant In-Service (12/31/99) \$68,120,709.00

(A) – Percentage of average remaining depreciation lives to total depreciation lives.

AmerenUE Illinois Distribution Plant

<u>Description</u>	<u>Average Age (1)</u>	<u>Remaining Depreciable Life</u>	<u>Total Depreciation</u>	<u>(A) %</u>
Land and Land Rights	26.6	(4)	26.6	100.00%
Substation Structures	33.9	27.1	61.0	44.43%
Substation Equipment	25.3	18.7	44.0	42.50%
Poles and Fixtures	18.1	15.9	34.0	46.76%
Overhead Conductor and Devices	18.1	17.9	36.0	49.72%
Conduit	27.4	56.6	84.0	67.38%
Underground Conductor and Devices	16.5	28.5	45.0	63.33%
Transformers	31.5	8.5	40.0	21.25%
Services – Overhead	19.1	16.9	36.0	46.94%
Services – Underground	10.9	34.1	45.0	75.78%
Meters	15.6	20.4	36.0	56.67%
Installations on Customer Premises	26.2	19.8	46.0	43.04%
Street Lighting and Signaling	12.3	10.7	23.0	46.52%

Total Plant In-Service (12/31/99) \$141,914,254.00

(A) – Percentage of average remaining depreciation lives to total depreciation lives.

- (1) The average of age of facilities was determined by using aged plant-in-service balances At 12/31/99 and was calculated using the Gannett Fleming Depreciation Programs.
- (2) Transmission land is not depreciated & land rights are amortized at a rate of 1% per year.
- (3) The average age is not available for Illinois Transmission Land and Structures.
- (4) Distribution land is not depreciated.

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

1999 Transmission Expenditures	\$2,627,000
Transmission Investment	\$68,120,709.00
Ratio of Transmission Expenditures/Transmission Investment	0.04
1999 Distribution Expenditures	\$11,234,000
Distribution Investment	\$141,914,254.00
Ratio of Distribution Expenditures/Distribution Investment	0.08

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

Listed below is the facility plant information for 1998.

AmerenUE Illinois Transmission Plant

<u>Description</u>	<u>Average Age (1)</u>	<u>Remaining Depreciable Life</u>	<u>Total Depreciation</u>	<u>(A) %</u>
Land and Land Rights	(3)	(2)		
Substation Structures	(3)	(3)		
Substation Equipment	27.8	22.2	50.0	44.40%
Towers and Fixtures	31.0	19.0	50.0	38.00%
Poles and Fixtures	28.2	14.8	43.0	34.42%
Overhead Conductor and Devices	24.1	35.9	60.0	59.83%
Roads and Trails	85.5	49.5	135.0	36.67%

Total Plant In-Service (12/31/98) \$61,770,414.83

(A) – Percentage of average remaining depreciation lives to total depreciation lives.

AmerenUE Illinois Distribution Plant

<u>Description</u>	<u>Average Age (1)</u>	<u>Remaining Depreciable Life</u>	<u>Total Depreciation</u>	<u>(A) %</u>
Land and Land Rights	25.6	(4)	25.6	100.00%
Substation Structures	33.8	27.2	61.0	44.59%
Substation Equipment	24.8	19.2	44.0	43.64%
Poles and Fixtures	18.0	16.0	34.0	47.06%
Overhead Conductor and Devices	16.2	19.8	36.0	55.00%
Conduit	27.0	57.0	84.0	67.86%
Underground Conductor and Devices	16.2	28.8	45.0	64.00%
Transformers	30.9	9.1	40.0	22.75%
Services – Overhead	18.0	18.0	36.0	50.00%
Services – Underground	10.5	34.5	45.0	76.67%
Meters	17.6	18.4	36.0	51.11%
Installations on Customer Premises	25.2	20.8	46.0	45.22%
Street Lighting and Signaling	11.9	11.1	23.0	48.26%

Total Plant In-Service (12/31/98) \$138,738,681.33

(A) – Percentage of average remaining depreciation lives to total depreciation lives.

- (1) The average of age of facilities was determined by using aged plant-in-service balances At 12/31/98 and was calculated using the Gannett Fleming Depreciation Programs.
- (2) Transmission land is not depreciated & land rights are amortized at a rate of 1% per year.
- (3) The average age is not available for Illinois Transmission Land and Structures.
- (4) Distribution land is not depreciated.

Revised AmerenUE 2000 Reliability Assessment

1998 Transmission Expenditures	\$6,663,000
Transmission Investment	\$61,770,414
Ratio of Transmission Expenditures/Transmission Investment	0.11
1998 Distribution Expenditures	\$8,743,000
Distribution Investment	\$138,738,681
Ratio of Distribution Expenditures/Distribution Investment	0.06

Facility plant information for 1997 is unavailable.

Attachment C – Operating Area Qualitative Assessment

The transmission and distribution system in the AmerenUE-Illinois area consists of overhead and underground facilities located in both urban and semi-rural areas. The majority of these facilities are located in urban areas. These facilities are inspected and maintained on a regular basis. The general terrain is flat with some hills. Based on the routine visual inspections indicating the physical condition of the facilities and the reliability indices indicating the quantity and causes of the electrical interruptions, the transmission and distribution facilities in this operating area are considered to be in good condition. This assessment covers the years of 1997-2000.